

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-47 are pending. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance

§§ 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,678,041 to Baker et al. (hereinafter "Baker"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baker describes a system and method for restricting user access rights on the Internet based on rating information stored in a relational database. Baker describes that "there exists no simple means for an authority (i.e., teacher, supervisor, system administrator, etc.) to selectively control WWW access by one or more users without significantly impairing the users ability to communicate with the Internet." *See Baker, Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 3.* To provide this control, Baker describes a rating system "that allows one or more network administrators/managers to rate particular information and/or services", the rating is utilized "to restrict specific system users from accessing the information/service via certain public or otherwise uncontrolled databases". *See Baker, Col. 3, Lines 11-14.* Baker then describes a "relational database [which] is arranged so that for each user of the system a request for a particular resource will only be passed on from the local network to a server providing a link to the public/uncontrolled database if the resource identifier has an access rating for which the user has been assigned specific permissions by an administrator/manager". *See Baker, Col. 3,*

1 *Lines 21-29.* Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest an association between
2 users, or selectively providing information about the association.

3 **Claim 1** recites a method which includes "associating a first entity with a
4 second entity in a first device" and "selectively providing information about the
5 association of the first and second entities to a second device as directed by the
6 first entity, without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated with
7 either the first or second device". The Office first asserts that the "associating" as
8 recited above is described in Baker at column 3, lines 60-65, the portion of which
9 is excerpted as follows:

10 As shown in FIG. 1, the system includes public network 100,
11 network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users
12 at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user
13 terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is
14 linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111
15 within proxy server 112. *Baker, Col. 3, Lines 60-65.*

16 As shown in the above referenced portion, Baker merely describes user terminals
17 linked by a local area network.

18 The Office then asserts that "selectively providing" as recited above is
19 described in Baker at column 5, lines 45-65, the portion of which is excerpted as
20 follows:

21 In the particular embodiment described above, relational
22 database 114 stores a list of user terminal identification codes
23 and the various user clearances reflective of the ratings of
24 network resources that each user terminal should be allowed
25 to retrieve from public network 100. It will be understood that
the invention could be modified so that the list of user
clearances associated with a given user terminal identification
code serves as a restrictive list (i.e.; that user is not allowed to
retrieve network resources having that rating). This restrictive
listing functionality could be readily facilitated by
reprogramming processor 111. In addition, the invention
could be modified so that the identification codes recognized
by processor 111 and stored in relational database 114 are

1 user specific, as opposed to user terminal specific. In other
2 words, the system of FIG. 1 could be modified so that a given
3 individual using a terminal is identified to the system by a
4 personal password or other identifying code. Access or denial
of the transmission of particular URLs is effected by the
system as a function of that person's identity, regardless of the
particular user terminal they may be utilizing. *Baker, Col. 5,
Lines 45-65.*

5 As show in the above referenced portion, Baker merely describes using user
6 specific identification codes so that access or denial of a transmission from a
7 particular URL is a function of that user's identity. It is respectfully submitted
8 that the Office has misinterpreted the language of Claim 1.

9 Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest "associating a first entity with a
10 second entity in a first device" as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the referenced
11 portion of Baker merely describes user terminals linked by a local area network. It
12 is respectfully submitted that the rejection made by the Office is unclear. For
13 example, does the proxy server 112 of Baker associate the user terminal 107 with
14 the user terminal 108? Clarification is respectfully requested.

15 Regardless, Barker does not disclose, teach or suggest "selectively
16 providing information about the association of the first and second entities". In
17 neither the above referenced portion nor elsewhere in Baker is information about
18 an association mentioned. Further, the assertion made by the Office in rejecting
19 Claim 1 further supports this argument. Assuming for the sake of argument only
20 that the user terminals are the first and second entities and the proxy server is the
21 first device, nowhere in Baker does the proxy server selectively provide
22 information about the association of the user terminals to a second device. Rather,
23 each of the user terminals in Baker has "user clearances [which] indicate that the
24 particular rating class or classes of network resources that a given user terminal is
25 allowed to access". See *Baker, Col. 4, Lines 26-28*. Baker uses the ratings such

1 that "if the resource identifier has an access rating for which the user has been
2 assigned specific permissions by an administrator/manager". *See Baker, Col. 3,*
3 *Lines 21-29.* Thus, Baker does not disclose information about an association
4 between of first and second entities. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a
5 *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of the
6 rejection is respectfully requested.

7 **Claims 2-11** depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are
8 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
9 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
10 in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
11 singly or in combination with one another.

12 **Claim 9**, for example, recites "wherein the first entity is a parent/guardian
13 of the second entity", which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Baker. The
14 Office asserts that the one or more network administrators/managers are the
15 "parent guardian". This is not the case and is inconsistent with the previous
16 assertions made by the Office. For example, if the first entity is the network
17 administrator, there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Baker for
18 information about the association of the network administrator with another entity.

19 **Claim 12** recites a computer-readable medium which includes "associating
20 a first entity with a second entity in a first device" and "causing the first device to
21 selectively provide information about the association of the first and second
22 entities to a second device as directed by the first entity, without requiring the
23 second entity to be operatively associated with either the first or second device".
24 Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest these aspects.
25

1 As described in relation to Claim 1, Baker does not disclose, teach or
2 suggest "information about the association of the first and second entities".
3 Rather, Baker merely describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal
4 which is utilized to determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access
5 information from a database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of
6 the rejection with respect to Claim 12 is respectfully requested.

7 Claims 13-22 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are
8 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
9 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
10 in claim 12, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
11 singly or in combination with one another.

12 Claim 23 recites an apparatus having "memory having information
13 associating a first user of the apparatus with a second user of the apparatus" and
14 "logic operatively coupled to the memory and configured to respond to inputs
15 from the first user by selectively outputting the information about the association
16 of the first user and the second user, without requiring the second user to be
17 operatively signed-in to the apparatus". Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest
18 these aspects.

19 As described in relation to Claims 1 and 12, Baker does not disclose, teach
20 or suggest "information about the association of the first and second entities".
21 Rather, Baker merely describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal
22 which is utilized to determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access
23 information from a database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of
24 the rejection with respect to Claim 23 is respectfully requested.
25

1 **Claims 24-31** depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 23 and are
2 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
3 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
4 in claim 23, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
5 singly or in combination with one another.

6 **Claim 32** recites "a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a
7 data structure, comprising: a validation code that identifies a first entity and a
8 second entity." Baker does not disclose, teach or suggest these aspects. The
9 Office asserts that Claim 32 has "limitations that is similar to those of claim 1,
10 thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above".
11 *Office Action Dated October 6, 2004, Page 4.* The Applicant respectfully
12 disagrees. However, following this assertion, the Applicant submits that Claim 32
13 is allowable based on the reasoning offered in respect to Claim 1. Additionally,
14 Claim 32 is also allowable based on the recitation of "a validation code that
15 identifies and first entity and a second entity", which is not disclosed, taught or
16 suggested by Baker.

17 **Claims 33-36** depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 32 and are
18 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
19 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
20 in claim 32, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
21 singly or in combination with one another.

22 **Claim 37** recites an apparatus having "memory" and "logic operatively
23 coupled to the memory and configured to allow a first entity to be operatively
24 associated with the apparatus, and receive information about an association of the
25 first entity and at least one other entity, without requiring the at least one other

1 entity to be operatively associated with the apparatus". Baker does not disclose,
2 teach or suggest these features.

3 As described in relation to Claims 1, 12 and 23, Baker does not disclose,
4 teach or suggest "information about an association". Rather, Baker merely
5 describes a separate user clearance for each user terminal which is utilized to
6 determine whether the user terminal is permitted to access information from a
7 database based a resource rating. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection with
8 respect to Claim 37 is respectfully requested.

9 Claims 38-47 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 37 and are
10 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also
11 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited
12 in claim 37, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either
13 singly or in combination with one another.

1 Conclusion

2 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant
3 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next
4 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,
5 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an
6 interview.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10 Dated: 1/24/05

By: 

11 William J. Breen III
12 Reg. No. 45,313
13 (509) 324-9256 x249
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25